

Date: Sat, 10 Sep 94 04:30:13 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #436  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Sat, 10 Sep 94                      Volume 94 : Issue 436

Today's Topics:

                    Dan's new catch phrase  
                    Equipment modification & the FCC  
Morse code as a common language? (was Re: Sum'tin for nut'in an  
                    Sum'tin for nut'in and chicks for free (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: 9 Sep 1994 13:19:07 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!nic-nac.CSU.net!charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!olivea!korie!l  
newsworthy.West.Sun.COM!abyss.West.Sun.COM!usenet@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Dan's new catch phrase  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article M2r@news.Hawaii.Edu, jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>(gregory brown) writes:

>

>>While it does seem somewhat unfair that code tests are required for  
>>"non-code" HF frequencies (the only valid argument), the fact that HF

>

>But Greg, CW is actually allowed everywhere on each band, so there  
>really is no non-code HF freqs (maybe you meant that by your " ").

C'mon, Jeff. You should know that CW is legal on all amateur frequencies.  
There are no non-code HF, VHF, UHF, SHF or other, amateur frequencies.

I personally do not believe the "require code test for access to code frequencies"

argument. The ultimate test is operating. Don't forget that the precedent is already set: the FCC allows Technicians full access to the 50.0 to 50.1 MHz and 144.0 to 144.1Mhz CW-only sub-bands. No code test is required for access to these code-only bands. End of argument.

---

\* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD#: j | Views expressed here are

\*

\* (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily \*

\* Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer

\*

\* "Sir, over there.... is that a man?"

\*

-----

Date: Fri, 9 Sep 1994 11:28:29 GMT

From: world!drt@uunet.uu.net

Subject: Equipment modification & the FCC

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Karl Beckman (CSLE87@email.mot.com) wrote:

: By the way, does anybody understand the difference between "marine" and  
: "maritime" operation as defined by the FCC?? Marine is when you are inside  
: the coastal limits of the USA and therefore subject to FCC jurisdiction.  
: Maritime operation is ONLY in international waters and you are then subject  
: only to the International Maritime requirements.

I can't find these FCC defintions. Part 80 only says that the Maritime Mobile service is for use by ship stations and those communicating with them. Not only does Part 97 say nothing that I can see, they don't require "/MM1" if you're in Maritime Mobile Region 1, either.

Any help?

-drt

-----

|David R. Tucker      KG2S              8P9CL              drt@world.std.com|

-----

-----

Date: 9 Sep 1994 15:27:31 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!usc!nic-

nac.CSU.net!charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!olivea!korie!newsworthy.West.Sun.COM!

abyss.West.Sun.COM!usenet@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Morse code as a common language? (was Re: Sum'tin for nut'in an  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article ekm@news.iastate.edu, wjturner@iastate.edu (William J Turner) writes:  
>In article <34nsi2\$r26@crcnis1.unl.edu> gbrown@unlinfo.unl.edu (gregory brown)  
writes:

>>Actually, Cecil, you can actually do that. Many of us have.  
>>Besides using international Q signals, the very fact that morse is  
>>slower gives people with limited language skills a little more time to  
>>think of how to say something. I can carry on a very reasonable  
>>contact in Spanish in CW, but doing so by voice is quite a different  
>>story. Many foreign amateurs I have talked with actually use CW  
>>(code) simply \_because\_ their english is so poor. So, the answer is  
>>yes, CW \_is\_ that powerful. Thanks for helping to emphasize that  
>>fact.

>

>They \*still\* have to know a common language, at least a little. If you  
>have no clue about a language, copying morse code in that language is  
>not going to magically let you understand it. (That seems to be what  
>some people are saying, and it is just plain wrong.)

Morse code is not a language, anymore than ASCII is a language. Anyone  
who says otherwise is ignoring reality. Just like ASCII, Morse code is  
a set of digital encodings to communicate some particular character  
set. Just like ASCII, there are alternatives, such as EBCDIC. Most of  
the time when people discuss Morse code, we're discussing the  
International Morse code. There are several other Morse code sets,  
such as the Japanese Morse code. Just like trying to display EBCDIC on  
an ASCII tube, someone trained in copying International Morse code  
won't make sense of a domestic variant of code. Heck, just a few  
Esperanto characters is enough to mess most folks up.

The International Morse code does do a lot to make it possible to  
communicate across national boundaries; it forces everyone using it to  
communicate in a certain character set, much the same way ASCII does.  
So, Morse code isn't a common language, despite claims to the contrary  
by the Morse romantics, but International Morse code forces the use of  
a common character set. Maybe the argument is really "International  
Morse code is a common character set".

In fact, this advantage of International Morse code is also found in  
ASCII communications. So, the "it is a common character set" argument  
could easily be made for ASCII (as well as Baudot, and the TOR  
character set(s)). Digital operators enjoy the exact same advantage  
of Morse code; the use of a common character set.

Indeed, this leaves us with one real advantage of Morse code over other  
digital encodings: Morse code is the only encoding method which is

practical to be encoded and decoded by a human operator without the use of machinery (at fairly low speeds). I guess this makes Morse code very attractive to many people, but how does it make it compelling as a requirement?

---

\* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD#: j | Views expressed here are

\*

\* (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily \*

\* Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer

\*

\* "Sir, over there.... is that a man?"

\*

-----

Date: 9 Sep 1994 13:14:45 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!nic-nac.CSU.net!charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!olivea!korie!  
newsworthy.West.Sun.COM!abyss.West.Sun.COM!usenet@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Sum'tin for nut'in and chicks for free

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article 531@ted.win.net, mjsilva@ted.win.net (Michael Silva) writes:

>What purpose is served by allowing these engineering wizards access to  
>HF phone? Is HF phone really the cutting edge? How are they going to  
>apply their engineering talents there? Seems to me that they'd just be  
>wasting time jawboning when they should be applying their technical  
>prowess, which gained them their special entry status, by expanding the  
>frontiers of the hobby, which are VHF/UHF/SHF. But wait, don't we  
>already \*have\* a license for that?

Wait a minute, Mike. You're saying that the frontiers of communication are VHF/UHF/SHF, with the exclusion of HF. That is not correct. Even in the amateur community, there's some really new work being done with digital transmission, with Clover, Clover II, G-TOR and other modes being developed which provide reliable communications under the adverse conditions found on HF. Narrower bandwidth, better error correction, etc. Standards are being developed for automatic link establishment (ALE) intended for improving the reliability of HF data communications. Bottom line, HF is not dead as far as new, avant garde development goes.

Furthermore, when engineers communicate, ideas are often formed and developed. I'm not trying to paint some utopian picture, that the elimination or replacement of the Morse requirements will suddenly cause cerebral discussion to become the norm on 20m, but it is not a fair argument to say "So what if engineers get access to HF? They'd just waste time jawboning". This isn't fair at all.

>Furthermore, it really makes no sense to pass a CW test to get access  
>to band segments where nobody is working CW.

It makes no sense, I think, to require a Morse test to gain access to a band where everybody is working Morse. It isn't like a driving test. The point of a driving test is to try to make sure an applicant isn't a danger to others on the road. In the case of Morse code, there is no benefit to using Morse code if you haven't learned it. People that drive poorly will continue to drive because they still usually get where they're going. People that do Morse code poorly won't stick around the CW sub-bands very long. I'm really saying it: the ultimate test of Morse ability is operating with it on the air.

---

\* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD#: j | Views expressed here are

\*

\* (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily \*

\* Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer

\*

\* "Sir, over there.... is that a man?"

\*

-----

Date: 9 Sep 1994 16:28:43 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!convex!

news.duke.edu!eff!news.kei.com!ssd.intel.com!chnews!fallout!

cmoore@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Sum'tin for nut'in and chicks for free

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Jeffrey Herman (jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu) wrote:

: >(I replied:)

: ^^^^^^^^^^^^^

: Where did this come from? Was it in the original?

I appologize for assuming it was implied in the original (but maybe you didn't infer properly). :-)

: I believe the original was a conversation between two hypothetical  
: people - a ham and a non-ham. So my remark was \*supposed\* to be  
: directed towards the hypothetical ham who called learning the  
: code 'nonsense'. It wasn't supposed to be directed at you, Cec  
: (unless you really believe that learning the code is nonsense!)

Hi Jeff, the hypothetical ham was me and I do believe that learning the code when one never intends to use it is nonsense (except, of course, it is nonsense presently required by the federal government). I also believe that going past 5wpm for the sole purpose of passing the general-class test is nonsense and that the rules should

be changed. I believe that one should improve one's code past 5wpm only if one intends to use code. Otherwise, I believe it is a waste of time. It is akin to requiring all drivers to pass a motorcycle driver's test before they are allowed to attempt the automobile driver's test even if one never intends to ride a motorcycle. As a Harley owner, don't anybody try to convince me that CW is more important than motorcycles!

I believe that CW should be de-emphasized and technical competence should be emphasized in the higher license classes. I do not believe we need more EE's, just more technical competence in the higher license classes (advanced and extra).

No hard feelings. I realize now that your attack was upon a hypothetical ham, which I am not. :-)

73, KG7BK, 00TC, Cecil\_A\_Moore@ccm.ch.intel.com (Not speaking for Intel)

-----  
Date: 9 Sep 1994 14:32:30 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!pacbell.com!sgiblab!swrinde!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!  
vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!  
wjturner@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <940907164954178@digcir.cts.com>, <34ndlg\$cbg@chnews.intel.com>,  
<34nsi2\$r26@crcnis1.unl.edu>ixe  
Subject : Re: Sum'tin for nut'in an

In article <34nsi2\$r26@crcnis1.unl.edu> gbrown@unlinfo.unl.edu (gregory brown) writes:

>Actually, Cecil, you can actually do that. Many of us have.  
>Besides using international Q signals, the very fact that morse is  
>slower gives people with limited language skills a little more time to  
>think of how to say something. I can carry on a very reasonable  
>contact in Spanish in CW, but doing so by voice is quite a different  
>story. Many foreign amateurs I have talked with actually use CW  
>(code) simply \_because\_ their english is so poor. So, the answer is  
>yes, CW \_is\_ that powerful. Thanks for helping to emphasize that  
>fact.

They \*still\* have to know a common language, at least a little. If you have no clue about a language, copying morse code in that language is not going to magically let you understand it. (That seems to be what some people are saying, and it is just plain wrong.)

-----

Date: 9 Sep 1994 15:40:26 GMT  
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd.lkg.dec.com!iamu.chi.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <Cvr4u1.6wL@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <090794142445Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,  
<1994Sep8.144713.3763@ve6mgs.ampr.org>com  
Reply-To : little@iamu.chi.dec.com (Todd Little)  
Subject : Re: Sum'tin for nut'in and chicks for free

In article <1994Sep8.144713.3763@ve6mgs.ampr.org>, mark@ve6mgs.ampr.org (Mark G. Salyzyn) writes:

|>dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill) writes:

|>

|>>And manual morse is a very inefficent mode. Why spend time on inefficency?

|>

|>Yup, I can fit 30 CW conversations at 25WPM (each sending effectively faster  
|>than a voice conversation) within the same bandwidth of a SSB contact. Lets  
|>just say we eliminate SSB, FM and AM first before you go onto CW ...

I've heard of a drawl before, but talking at 25 WPM is like watching a movie  
in slow motion. Unless you're suggesting that the phone users spell out each  
word instead of saying them. ;-)

And unless the average CW op spaces their contacts every 75 Hz as you're  
suggesting, then the above is like saying you can enscribe the entire  
King James bible on the head of a pin, i.e. so what?

I think the following sums it up pretty well:

In article <531@ted.win.net>, mjsilva@ted.win.net (Michael Silva) writes:

|>

|>Furthermore, it really makes no sense to pass a CW test to get access  
|>to band segments where nobody is working CW.

73,  
Todd  
N9MWB

-----

Date: Fri, 09 Sep 1994 04:41:00 EST  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!  
europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.umbc.edu!eff!wariat.org!amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <Cvr4u1.6wL@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <34kpbs\$a8c@chnews.intel.com>,

<34ls31\$e8l@crcnis1.unl.edu>gtefsd.

Subject : Re: Sum'tin for nut'in and chicks for free

gbrown@unlinfo.unl.edu (gregory brown) writes:

>With code tests today (I whistle the same tune again!), however, it is  
>not difficult to understand why there may be more "machine code" out  
>there,

{Flame-Resistant mode active}       ;-)

> but I seriously doubt your estimates. Matter of fact, I'll set  
>aside a day or two, make hundred contacts or so, and ask every one if  
>s/he is sending with a keyboard and receiving with a computer and  
>report the results if anyone is interested. My prediction??? I'll  
>say....7 out of a hundred. Anyone want to get in on the pool?

Pool? No. Interested? Yes. We must of course allow an error factor as some  
may not wish to 'admit' they are using machines.

I am very curious so even if you do not post it. Please email me with the  
results. Also, can you make this an ongoing thing. Just a sampling mind  
you, since you enjoy the contacts that much. May I assume these are more  
QSO's than contest type contacts? Just every so often ask and let me (us?)  
know. If you don't mind.

{Flame-Resistant mode de-active}   :-)

>Standard final comment: "None of this, of course, has anything to do  
>with anything".

This is true. But is is an interesting, though not exactly "on topic"  
discussion. It may not be "policy" and if any object maybe we could start  
a mailing list to discuss it (Manual vs Machine CW useage).

Dan

--

"We can't be so fixated on our desire to preserve the rights of  
ordinary Americans.." -- President William Jefferson Clinton

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #436

\*\*\*\*\*